UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVI MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1925 NUMBER 9

"That man, I think, has had a liberal education, who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure all the work that, as a mechanism, it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic engine, with all its parts of equal strength and in smooth working order; ready, like a steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind; whose mind is stored with a knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of Nature and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all beauty, whether of Nature or of art, to hate all vileness, and to respect others as himself."

—Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1925).

The *Christian Century,* the *Christian Register,* and other religious papers have started systematic, well organized and expensively financed campaigns for the increase of their subscription lists. We envy them! They have business managers, men paid full-time salaries to boost subscriptions, secure advertising, rush publicity, etc. We have nothing of the sort. They have money, apparently, to throw generously into this exciting game. We have not a penny. Our sole reliance is our readers. If we are to get new subscribers, *they* must get them for us. Each subscriber who peruses these words must feel a responsibility for making himself forthwith *two* subscribers. Send sample copies to your friends—we will supply them if you will use them! Distribute circulars in homes, churches, public meetings—these we will also supply if you will use them! What we need is agents to sell our business, champions to establish our interests, crusaders to advance our cause. Who will help us?

At last the League of Nations advocates have got something to crow about. They certainly have! It has been a long time coming, and in sheer desperation the Leaguers have cheered lustily again and again over nothing at all. But now they have their opportunity, and if they don't make the most of it and "josh" the life out of the anti-Leaguers, it will be because they are made of nobler flesh than ordinary mortals. All of which means, of course, that the League of Nations has done a good job with the Greek-Bulgarian fracas! For the first time since it was established, the Geneva body has done what it was organized to do—nipped a war in the bud. It is the League's "first victory," to quote the New York *World,* as stanch an advocate of the League as exists in this country. A "victory" as it undoubtedly is, and a noble one, it is still no perfect or final victory. The League, in other words, is still on trial. When Greece attacked Bulgaria, she was following the villainous example of Italy in attacking her (Greece) a little over a year ago. In that episode it was loudly proclaimed that the League of Nations had saved the situation, and thus saved Europe from devastating war. A comparison, however, of what the League has just been doing to Greece today with what the League did or did not do to Italy yesterday, proves as a matter of fact that the League was an absolute failure in this earlier crisis, just as we said in these columns at the time. The Leaguers were simply fooling themselves, and trying to fool the rest of us, in pretending to be satisfied when Mussolini walked off with all the swag he could carry. But now the League is acting as it should have acted a year ago—to a small nation that cannot help itself, instead of to a large nation that can help itself very effectively indeed! This is the fly in the ointment. This is the reason for our statement that the League of Nations is still on trial. In one very simple case, involving weak powers, the League has prevented a war which might have proved disastrous, and has thus put one sure achievement to its credit. Now let it act with equal effectiveness in a difficult case involving great powers like Italy or France, and its victory will be complete.

Further consideration of the Locarno treaties has clarified our mind as to their character and significance. The agreements are far from perfect. Thus, their recognition of the sanction of force is deplorable. Their promise to use such sanction against the "aggressive" in case of war is something worse than deplorable—it is ridiculous; the "aggressive" is known never at the time but only years, perhaps decades, later. They obviously establish an alliance of powers interested in specific diplomatic ends, which is all too similar to old-time alliances not to be disquieting. They represent an attempt to set up a *status quo* as regards boundary lines, etc., which of course is inherently dangerous and ultimately futile. *But*—when all these and all other possible reservations have been noted, it still remains true that the Locarno agreements represent an enormous advance over anything yet achieved in the work of peace. Thus, they begin effectively the job of wiping out the Treaty of Versailles, a task of sanitation all too long delayed. They remove from European politics the

Alsace-Lorraine question which has vexed Europe for nearly two hundred years. They begin the priceless work of disintegrating the hatred and fear which have so long plagued relations between France and Germany, and spread at intervals like a pestilential contagion to all the rest of Europe. Above all, they establish the Outlawry of War principle as between France and Germany, banning war as a crime, and recognizing the arbitral or judicial process in the settlement of all disputes. These are great achievements, more especially the last. For the one thing that strikes us is the fact that, if the Outlawry of War can be established by treaty agreement between two such nations as France and Germany, there is no reason in the world why it cannot be established by similar treaty agreements between all nations whatsover, which is just the process presented by the Levinson-Borah program. The camel's head is in the tent! The Outlawry of War idea is vindicated at the one point where it was least expected to work, or rather where the difficulties were seen to be most serious. What wonder that, for all our reservations, we are hailing Locarno as a tremendous triumph!

We have been slow to comment upon the much-discussed report on "The Prohibition Situation," published by the Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of Churches, because we have desired to give it careful and thorough consideration. Now that we have done this, we want to say that we regard the report as one of the most remarkable documents of the kind we have ever seen, and the work of the Federal Council in preparing and publishing it a public service of incalculable importance. The criticisms and denunciations showered upon the report by certain of the religious bodies of the country show only its effectiveness as a statement and interpretation of facts. Of course the facts are not presented as in any way final or complete; one of the outstanding merits of the document is its depiction of the extreme complexity of the problem and of the exceeding difficulty in ascertaining the exact conditions involved. But such facts as are available, or could be made available by exhaustive research, the report faces without flinching and interprets without prejudice. The result is a picture discouragingly and somewhat unexpectedly dark, but not by any means the picture of "failure" described by most of the newspapers which have discussed the findings. Not a line in this report justifies the use of the word "failure." Prohibition is no more a failure than Christianity. On the contrary, like Christianity, prohibition has not yet been tried—not only has much public opinion been complacent, indifferent or hostile, but enforcement efforts by the government have been half-hearted and inefficient where they have not been also utterly corrupt. Worse still has been the abandonment all along the line of that sustained work of education which made possible the prohibition amendment in the beginning, and which now must sustain and vindicate it. On this subject of constructive work still to be done, the report is at its best and is most to be commended to its critics. If there is any qualification in our admiration for this wonderful piece of work, it is in the feeling that the dark side of the situation has been perhaps exaggerated. Other far less complete but equally unprejudiced reports give some reason for such feeling. But the fault, if real, is a happy one, and will in the end do much good. One other fault is the absence of the name of the man most responsible for the report—Dr. F. Ernest Johnson. He deserves to be known, and praised!

The verdict of the Harvard professors on the famous medium, "Margery," and her alleged spiritist manifestation, should rightly lay for good and all this monstrous silliness of Spiritualism. As a matter of fact, of course, it will do nothing of the sort, for people just love to be fooled, and there has never been found a more exciting way of being fooled than by these so-called communications with the dead. But just look at what has hoppened! The *Scientific American* offers a substantial prize for any real spiritist phenomena, and "Margery" apparently qualifies. She performs prodigies which amaze onlookers and baffle investigators. Then the famous Houdini comes along and says frankly that "Margery" is a fraud. He witnesses her feats, tells how they are done, and proceeds to reproduce them. But Houdini is only a magician, so of course he doesn't count. Why he isn't just the man to count enormously, has never been explained! At last, a group of distinguished Harvard scientists enter the field and hold a long series of seances with the medium. After all is over, the majority of the group declares in a signed statement

> that the group is in absolute agreement that the only conclusion possible to them is that trickery accounted for all the phenomena; that the only possible difference of opinion in the group is to what extent the trickery was unconscious.

If anything could be definite and final, this is it. "Margery," like every other medium ever adequately investigated, is consciously or unconsciously a fraud. To us this is an ineffable, an indescribable relief. If any medium ever proved his case, we should fall into despair indeed. For if the dead have no better occupation than tipping tables and ringing bells, if they have no higher mentality than that revealed in the communications vouchsafed us by the seances, then we do not want to die. John Fiske hit the mark when he said in his "Life Everlasting" (page 60), referring to the evidence of mediums—

> If its value as evidence were to be conceded, it would seem to point to the conclusion that the grade of intelligence which survives the grave is about on a par with that which in the present life we are accustomed to shut up in asylums for idiots.

We received some weeks ago from the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee, a "Financial Report" covering its operations from May 5, 1920, to July 31, 1925. We have lived something more than our fourth decade, and we have seen some reports and statements in our time, but this document breaks all previous records known to our experience. A pamphlet, 9x6, it contains no less than 96 pages, of which 86 are the mere items of "Income" and "Disbursements" from month to month during this more than five-year period. One specimen page, chosen at random, contained 173 separate items. At the close comes the "Recapitulation," which shows a "Total Income" of $287,274.68, and "Total Disbursements" of $282,715.40. Here is a rough average of $57,000 a year, for five years, received and expended for the defense of men against a charge of murder as unsubstantial, we believe, as any charge ever seriously tried in a court of law. But this is not the whole, nor even a half, of the story. Turn to the pages of itemized accounts, and see how the sums contributed are all in small amounts—$1, $2, $3, $10, $26, $13.65, $37.50, $50, and so on! A hasty survey of a dozen pages shows only a few gifts of $100 or more. And note the sources of these contributions—collections at mass meetings, appropriations of local unions and volunteer defense committees, innumerable little gifts from obviously poor individuals! What a record of human sacrifice and devotion! Here are the sweat and blood and tears of men gladly offered up on behalf of justice and the right! If ever there was a sacred volume, this is it. And what has it all amounted to? In the preface, page 4, we read:

> The fight for Sacco and Vanzetti is not over; the men are still in the shadow of the electric chair.

On page 7, we read of the hiring of new counsel, of an appeal to the Massachusetts Supreme Court, and of arguments to be heard in this appeal November, 1925. On the title-page we find a slip roughly pasted on, printed in red ink: "Lovers of Justice, Help Sacco-Vanzetti Defense." *What price justice* in these United States to-day?

The latest balloting for the Hall of Fame raises anew the baffling question as to how intelligent and educated men can go so far astray in the matter of judgment on human worth and achievement. Remember, please, that the electors are chosen from recognized leaders in all walks of life throughout the Union. To the sixty-three illustrious names already placed in the Hall, these electors have now added two more—Edwin Booth and John Paul Jones—chosen out of a nominated list of twenty-seven. That Edwin Booth should be selected is obvious—the wonder is that this most eminent exemplar of his great art should have had to wait till this late year for admission. But John Paul Jones, a "scrappy" sea-fighter in the days of silly duels between single ships—imagine his being elected in preference to men like Walt Whitman, William Lloyd Garrison, Samuel Adams, William Penn, and Henry David Thoreau! Still more amazing is the relative standing of various candidates. Thus, George Rogers Clark, whom the newspapers have to identify for their readers as "a Revolutionary fighter," got more votes than Nathaniel Greene, the most distinguished soldier, next only to Washington, in the Revolutionary Army. Gen. Philip Sheridan, a cavalry commander, received twice as many votes as Benjamin Thompson (Count Rumford), one of the greatest modern scientists of our own or any land. Paul Revere stood within four votes of Wendell Phillips and within six votes of Thoreau. Walt Whitman stood tenth on the list, being headed, among others, by "Stonewall" Jackson, Matthew Fontaine Maury, Noah Webster, and Benjamin Rush. Of the twenty-seven candidates, no less than six—nearly one-fourth of the total—were warriors, and all of these stood in the first half of the selected order. The military mania certainly dies hard, even among the most highly cultured of our people! All in all, we call the result of this balloting extraordinary—and also discouraging!

To the Warring Sects

In the midst of a world groping for light, you raise a theological dust which blinds men's eyes. To men hungering for bread, you offer a stone. While the scales of justice tremble in the balance, you tithe anise and cummin. To a humanity stumbling and falling in sin, you offer a lifeless dogma. Amid the great realities of love, righteousness and beauty, you speak with faltering voice, instead of blowing with a certain trumpet. Amid the uncertainties and speculations of life, you thunder with unfounded conviction, and lay claim to knowledge which no one possesses.

What are your discordant theories and harsh debates doing for men? Are they liberating human slaves from the prisons of vice, hate and pettiness? Are they flooding the soul with gentleness and sweetness? Are they rallying the latent powers of men to triumph? Are they extending over the broken world the beauty of holiness and the calm of peace? Are they opening windows "of divine surprise" through which we can glimpse some heavenly vision?

Can you face these questions and continue to wrangle over creeds and ancient texts?

Which is more important: 1. To define the nature and person of the infinite with your finite mind, or to lead men forth on the greatest adventure life has to offer—a discovery in a man's own soul of what the infinite means to him?

2. To quibble over the nature of Jesus, to prison him

in a narrow cell of dogma, or to lead men by various paths to live that matchless life of the Nazarene in the free, open spaces of the world? To make Christ the third person of the Trinity accepted, or to make Jesus, our friend and inspirer, loved?

3. To stultify your minds and ours by proving an inspired Bible, without contradiction or fallacy, or to inspire men's lives by the noblest and loveliest utterances of the great men who wrote that Book?

4. To preach fastastic dogmas about an imaginary hell in some speculative place and time in the future, or to face the living terrors of the present world,—war, sin, greed, passion, poverty?

5. To force men to subscribe to the immortality of the soul, when we cannot know whether men have souls, and have had no proofs of immortality, or to make this life of here and now so splendid, so rich, that men will develop all there is in them of power and love?

6. To emphasize the differences among men so as to divide them and to organize them into opposing forces, or to emphasize those differences so as to make them completions and supplements, organizing men into co-operative brotherhoods bound in mutual understandings?

7. To face the world with closed mind, chained to an outworn past, or to face the world with growing mind looking to new revealings of truth?

8. To battle science with assumptions, or to direct science to constructive moral purposes by accepting its laws, seeking its aid and joining in its quest?

When will the warring sects choose the better part?

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Jottings

The Germans and French have agreed never again to fight. The Ku Klux Klan in Detroit have invited the Negroes and Jews to help them in the mayoralty campaign. An aeroplane collided with a submarine in the bay of Spezia. These events are conclusive. We shall henceforth believe that anything is possible.

We wonder who is to be La Follette's official biographer. Happy the man, whoever he may be, for we cannot imagine more wonderful material than must be available in this case! It is good to note that a great La Follette Memorial meeting, at the Community Church, New York, is being planned for December 6th next, just at the opening of the new Congress.

It is interesting to read the reports of what France is doing in Syria — butchering helpless populations, bombing cities and villages, wantonly destroying fine old buildings, ancient mosques, etc. It sounds for all the world like the Germans in Belgium!

Future historians of this country are not unlikely to call this period the "age of myths." Here is the myth of Calvin Coolidge, for example, the most remarkable legend that our nation has ever known. Almost as remarkable, and quite as baseless, is the myth of Walter Hines Page, a man who betrayed his country and yet is fast being fixed in the popular mind as the greatest of diplomats. The myth of German war-guilt opens up another and wider field of fairy-tale. It's a mythological period!

Conrad's "Suspense" joins the list of unfinished novels, of which Dickens's "The Mystery of Edwin Drood" is the most famous. Remembering the uncertainties of life, we marvel that this list is not much longer than it is. De Morgan's "The Old Madhouse" is the only recent one of which we can think.

A simple statement of fact is sometimes the severest form of indictment. For example, the *Christian Century* reports Dr. S. Parkes Cadman's recent address before the Unitarian Conference at Cleveland, as follows:

> Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, President of the Federal Council of Churches, told them (the Unitarians) that the way to a warless world is through a world federation of religions. The Federal Council does not admit Unitarians. J. H. H.

American Notes

(Editorial Correspondence)

I.

In Washington University, during the year 1924-25, while 4,417 students professed belief in some religion over 1,800 failed to note their religious preference. Only one enrolled as an "atheist." Twenty-five religions, ranging from ancient creeds to the most modern, were represented. It will please the Presbyterians to discover that they are the most numerous, with 1,027 so declared. . . . The situation in this University is fairly typical.

II

In the last few years there has been a marked increase in divorces granted for cruelty and failure to provide. About two-thirds of the divorces granted in 1925 were granted to couples married less than ten years. The proportion of divorces granted for adultery and cruelty is high during the early years, while that for desertion is low. "The proportion for drunkenness is low during the first four years and high afterward, and that for failure to provide high during the first four years. A little over one-third of the divorces granted in 1922 involved people who had children, while of those from 1887 to 1906 about two-fifths had children. Where there are children the percentage of wives seeking divorce is about double that of the husbands."

III

I recently sat in a discussion about rapid transit in Seattle—a question that is vital to every city in the world. While the disputants had in mind especially a city of half a million, yet some features of the discussion will be of general interest. It was pointed out that while considerably over a hundred million passengers were carried on the street-cars during the year 1908, considerably fewer passengers were carried in 1924, although the city had more than doubled its population. This is not local but is nation-wide. "The reason is the automobile." I think it may be said that the street car promises to become obsolete. At present auto-busses and trollies are struggling for supremacy in street traffic, with the busses making all the gain. After this discussion I went out to make a few observations. I noted that the traffic was often clogged because the slow, inflexible cars, when they stopped, blocked the way for the autos. The result was a momentary congestion. I talked with my postman and discovered that he came to his work every morning in his auto, because the "street-cars are too slow." I found that even the motormen and conductors of the street-car system came to their work in autos, instead of using the cars on which they worked. I wound that not a single one of the city councilmen used the street-car system, although it was municipally owned. And most striking, I found that practically all the clergymen of the city owned their autos, and did not patronize the street-cars. Even people holding passes did not use them on the street-cars. These incidents indicate the drift in American rapid transit in the cities. The objections against the street-car are somewhat as follows: They are slow, noisy, immobile, uncomfortable. It is expensive to maintain a car system, when the laying of the tracks, their repair, its interference with other functions of city life, overhead and underground (wires, sewers, pipes, etc.) is taken into consideration. The whole weight of opinion in this meeting seemed to be that the days of the trolley are numbered, that for the streets where there is traffic the motor-bus will be supreme. It was pointed out, however, that such means of transportation might be supplemented by ferries, or by electric trains which ran on tracks, quite apart from the street traffic, which were given up exclusively to these trains. It was also pointed out that if motor-busses were used (to even greater advantage than trains), exclusive highways might be constructed for long distance "express busses" each carrying from 50 to 100 passengers.

IV

When the clergy of the Episcopal (Anglican) Church speak out in radical terms the public generally "sits up" and takes notice. Here, for instance, is the bishop of Central New York speaking about "sanctimonious commercialism," and he says, "Protestantism conceives of God as a glorified Rotarian and, in consequence, many Americans are becoming sanctimoniously pious in their very commercialism. Protestantism is responsible for the present obsession of America in the attempt to remedy sin and false doctrine by legislation. It has been drifting into the blatant and vulgar substitute for religion, which is driving some of the best minds in America, especially among the young, into violent rebellion against organized Christianity." The president of St. Stephen's College, Bernard I. Bell, an Anglican, is yet more radical and specific. He states, in public print, that as a member of the Episcopal General Convention, he would find

> it impossible to vote for any resolution which even distantly hinted that it is a function of the Church to promote patriotism. . . . I should vote down all resolutions favoring prohibition, on the ground that it goes against the practice of Christ. . . . I should oppose all resolutions calling upon Christians to obey law and order, on the ground that it has been the custom of the saints frequently not to do so, whenever they deemed rebellion wise and necessary. . . . I should vote against resolutions endorsing the League of Nations and the World Court, on the ground that they are matters purely of statecraft,—not Christian but secular. . . . I should be ardently for resolutions affirming the binding character of the Christian law, the law of Jesus, on all Church people, and calling them to obey it at whatever cost. . . . I should favor the initiation of efforts to promote conferences among Christian people as to the consistency or inconsistency of Christian participation in war, of the profit-system, of child-labor, of holding property out of use, etc.; but I should avoid resolutions on these subjects as likely to mislead the public, who would suppose that the Church was assuming responsibility for the State. . . .

If prominent men of so conservative a Church in America speak thus—the future is likely to behold some plain talking and searching of heart, and freedom from monotony.

V

The polyglot population of America is frequently a subject of criticism. With 12,000,000 negroes and a good sprinkling of folks from every nation of Europe, there is no doubt of her polyglot character. "More Jews in New York than in Jerusalem, more Italians than in Rome, more Irish than in Belfast; more Swedes in Chicago than in Stockholm, more Norwegians in Minneapolis than in Bergen," etc. So America's composition is described. The question is whether America will be able to digest all these and not have indigestion, to speak of no greater calamity. Will the country go down under the weight of polyglotism?

There are a few things that ought in fairness to be said. There is no considerable part of the people, of whatever nationality or race, that has not made a real contribution to the nation's welfare and prosperity. This will apply to those who have come from countries as far apart as Norway and Italy. Thus far, the relation of the different peoples in America has been that of emulation, not of rivalry. Each has sought to make a good showing, and not to loot the land and crowd out the others. The last to come are generally hundred percenters. I noticed that among the commanding officers of the fleet visiting Australia were the names of Robinson, Cole, Coontz and Ziegemier. Robinson was the name of the pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers. Cole is plainly English, but Coontz and Ziegemier have the fragrance of the Rhine or the Danube. This is typically American. I am inclined to believe that different races living under the same flag tend to produce higher loyalty than homogeniety. It is certainly true that a variety of peoples in one nation makes daily life more interesting, and probably richer. Polyglotism produces many problems that come under the head of race problems, but again it is probable that such inevitable problems will be more easily settled when the people involved are in one national group. At least, I think that this will prove to be true in America. And judging by the way things in America are going, I am inclined to think that polyglotism is a thing to be approved rather than a thing to be condemned.

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Larger Bible*

If specimen theologians could be included in one of the big exhibitions now so common, I feel sure that the most popular exhibits would be the Fundamentalist and the Modernist! The interest of the religious world seems to be divided between them. No one else gets much attention. And perhaps they deserve the honour, for they *are* worthy of careful study.

With the modernist I have really no quarrel—except that he is not modern enough! A modernist seems to be a person who has unravelled the tangled skein of Christian theology as far back as Paul and then got tired—or frightened—or both. Perhaps the best thing to do is to leave him alone. Maybe when he has had a rest, and mustered a little more courage, he will go on with the good work.

But with the fundamentalist it is different. Something must be done about him. He has a habit of making himself heard. He is fitted with a loud speaker! Many take him seriously, and so must we. Not that I think he is really dangerous. Left alone he would die a natural death, but he might do much harm before the end came. For, whilst the modernist is in the line of evolution, the fundamentalist is a *reactionary* and for this reason he should be opposed. We have to remember that so long as people believe in a Devil, there *is* a Devil and he may frighten timid folk.

How then shall we deal with the fundamentalist? Some say, by paying more attention ourselves to the Bible which to him is a book apart. We might show that the Bible is a great human document, full of life and poetry; that God does indeed speak through it, though not quite in the way the fundamentalist claims. In other words we might meet him on his own ground and prove by means of his own "divinely inspired" book that he is wrong. Of course, this method has been tried, with a certain amount of success, but the task seems endless. The trouble is that the fundamentalist is a sort of theological Hydra; he keeps the modern Hercules so busy cutting off heads that he has no time left for anything else!

So I want to suggest another way. We must attack him at some more vulnerable point. I like the name fundamentalist—it suits these people very well. Their whole case rests on a fundamental error! Fundamentalism would be impossible if no one had made the mistake of placing the Bible in a class apart from the rest of literature. So long as the Bible remains apart, so long shall we have fundamentalists, and if we are helping in any way towards that isolation we are helping to manufacture fundamentalists. What is called liberal Christianity is not enough. It stands for a half-truth, and a half-truth if left alone automatically becomes a lie. The liberal Christianity of Paul did not save men from the particularism of the Fourth Gospel. It led inevitably to it. As Thoreau said, "It is necessary not to be Christian to appreciate the beauty and significance of the life of Christ."

First, we must get out of Christendom into the universe. There we shall find that the Bible is one of the many sacred books — immortal compositions full of beauty and inspiration. The use of them in our churches, the very bringing of them into juxtaposition with the Bible is an attack which the fundamentalist cannot counter. It is useless to tell men that God has never left himself without witnesses in every country, if you use the Bible in a way which suggests that he has always had a peculiar interest in a small tract of land at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean! As Walt Whitman said,

> The altitude of literature and poetry has always been Religion —and always will be. The Indian Vedas, the Naçkas of Zoroaster, the Talmud of the Jews, the Old Testament also, the Gospel of Christ and his disciples, Plato's works. . . . these with such poems only in which the religious tone, the consciousness of mystery, the recognition of the future, of the unknown, of Deity, over and under all, and of the divine purpose, are never absent, but indirectly give tone to all—exhibit literature's real heights and elevations, towering up like the great mountains of the earth.

We need not quarrel about which is greatest. It is like arguing about which is the highest peak in the Himalayas. The most likely result is to forget that all are in the Himalayas! I use all the world's Bibles for reading in church because I believe there is inspiration in all. Zoroaster, Confucius and Lao Tse take turn with Isaiah, Jeremiah and Amos. The great cosmogonic poems of the Rig Veda stand well beside the famous 38th Chapter of Job. Buddha and Jesus join hands and in their passion for humanity seem to embrace the world. I use the Buddhist Scriptures quite as much as the New Testament. They enforce the same message and have an advantage in the fact that their language is not "polarised"—to use Dr. Holmes' expressive word.

A book which should be on the lectern of all churches is Moncure Conway's "Sacred Anthology," which contains the cream of the world's Bibles. In that book we have 740 passages from the world's scriptures. They are classified under various subjects—Worship, Wisdom, Superstition, Character, Charity, Love, Friendship, and so on. Take the chapter on Charity. Instead of having to dig about amongst Jewish folklore, solar myths, and Christian superstitions to find a passage on charity, we have here ready for use fifty noble passages from the world's scriptures all emphasising the gospel of service—Paul's great psalm of love, several beautiful passages from the gospels side by side with extracts from Hindu, Buddhist, Confucian, Mohammedan and Persian Scriptures.

So much for the first step. Now for the next. Having stepped out of Christendom into the universe we shall find that not only has God never left himself without witnesses in any country, but that his prophets have spoken in all ages. We must find a place for the modern prophet. That is our next step.

> "The word were but a blank, a hollow sound,
> If He that spake it were not speaking still,
> If all the light and all the shade around,
> Were aught but issues of Almighty will."

We have to realise that all great books are sacred and that God speaks through such Bibles as Mazzini's "Duties of Man," Emerson's "Essays," Thoreau's "Walden," Whitman's "Leaves of Grass," Edward Carpenter's "Towards Democracy," and Richard Jeffries' "Story of My Heart," as he did through the Vedic Hymns, the Dhammapada and the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. When once we approach those older Bibles as literature we soon learn to make great literature our Bible.

But we have to learn how to use Bibles. We have to

*An address delivered in London, England, at a meeting of the Free Religious Movement towards World Religion and World Brotherhood.

show the fundamentalist how to use Bibles, for this is where he fails. We all know how the fundamentalist uses his Bible. I was told the other day by a good Christian, that "the stone cut out without hands" mentioned in Daniel 2, 34 was England. England, as we know, was once part of the Continent and was cut off from the mainland by the action of the waves or by some natural convulsion. I pointed out that the same was probably true of Tasmania and Iceland and Borneo and Jamaica and Madagascar, to say nothing of the Isle of Sheppey and a thousand other islands, around our coasts! This did not disturb our fundamentalist in the least. So I asked him if he accepted all the findings of modern geology, including things which corroborated the theory of evolution. The very word evolution upset him. Even when I pointed out that it was somewhere back in the far-off past revealed to us by the evolutionists that England got "cut out without hands" —that it could not possibly have happened since his creation in 4004 B. C.—he was still unperturbed and I am sure that he still believes that Daniel knew all about the part England was to play in the rise and fall of empires.

Probably you have been told that "the stone which the builders rejected" is the stone at the top of the Great Pyramid in Egypt. Thousands of people believe this very sincerely and search the scriptures for other references to the same mysterious monument. And recently we have read how thousands more have been hunting through the Christian Bible for references to Joanna Southcott and her famous box. Of course they have found them, and to-day there is always the chance of meeting someone who will seriously ask you to believe that when you read a passage in the Old Testament dealing with the Ark of the Covenant, "My testament that is in the Ark of the Covenant," you are to understand that it is just the biblical way of saying, "My will in my box." And that box is Joanna's!

The fundamental mistake of these people is that they never have learnt how to use their Bible. They have never grasped the simple fact that the Bible is great literature and belongs not to the literature of knowledge but to the literature of power. They use their Bibles as guide books and are never happy unless they know just what Jeremiah or Paul said in a certain verse of a certain chapter. We have to show them that a Bible is much more than a spiritual Bradshaw!

Professor Adams in one of his books on teaching tells us that he once saw a man fishing in a pond in Buckinghamshire with a book by his side with the alluring title, "How to Angle." Whenever matters became critical he referred to this book. . . . . We are only told one other thing about this man—but it is a significant thing. He caught no fish. The man who cannot go abroad in the world without his Bible is rather like this angler. He meets any number of difficulties, gets himself into endless knots. But he catches no fish. A Bible to mean anything must become part of a man —it must be inside him, not outside. He must catch the spirit instead of worrying unduly about the letter. How apt are the words of the Brahman seer, Pattanattu Pillai:—

Where'er wind blows or compass points,
God's light doth stream and shine. ,
Yet see yon fool—beneath his arm
He bears the sacred roll.

How carefully he folds the page
And draws the closing string!
See how he binds the living book,
That not a leaf escape!

Ah, yes! the truth should fill his heart;
But 'tis beneath his arm.
To him who knows, the sun is high;
To this, 'tis starless night.

To miss the spirit is to miss everything. The burning words of an Isaiah are lost on the man who only finds texts to prove his Messianic theory—and is not roused to indignation against the tyrants and the hypocrites of his own age.

Is not this the fast that I have chosen:
To loose the bands of wickedness . . . . .
And to let the oppressed go free? . . . . .
Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry,
And that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house?
When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him;
And that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?

Words like these were never meant for theologians to wrangle about. They were wrung from a poet's heart by the sight of suffering and distress. And they are lost unless we catch the same spirit.

In the same way the sweet words of a Buddha or a Jesus are lost if they do not thrill our hearts with a yearning tenderness towards the sinner and the outcast. We may be able to quote the words in Sanskrit and Pali or in Greek and Latin but that will avail nothing if we have not caught something of that all-embracing, redeeming love which filled the hearts of these Saviours of men.

Henry David Thoreau, writing of one of the oldest of Bibles, the Rig Veda, says, "While the commentators and translators are disputing about the meaning of this word and that, I hear only the resounding of the ancient sea, and put into it the deepest meaning I am possessed of." Here we have a hint as to how we should use all Bibles. They are sources of power and strength, but that power and strength must be translated into personality.

Of course we know all these things—in theory. But do we practise them? Or, when we argue, do we still pile up the commentaries and the proof texts? To use the Bible in anything like an exclusive sense and to take texts from it and argue from it as a supreme authority is to play into the hands of the fundamentalists. It also gives the lie to our own belief in the divinity of man. Only by using the Larger Bible of world literature shall we be able to convince the world of the universality of revelation.

If you want to test the usual method of using the Bible, try it on some other great book which you know quite well is worthy to be placed beside the Bible. I might try it on "Leaves of Grass." Suppose that some Sunday I took a text from "Leaves of Grass" and dealt with it in the way many ministers still deal with texts from the Bible. First I should give a long description of Long Island or Brooklyn or Manhattan. Then would come some unimportant details about Whitman's mother and brothers. I might spend ten minutes telling my congregation the exact wording of my text in the edition of 1855, showing how it had been altered in the edition of 1860-61 and again in the final authorised edition of 1891-2, giving my opinion as to why the alterations were made. I might spend a quarter of an hour giving the opinions of commentators on the text —the views of Dr. Bucke, H. Bryan Binns, John Burroughs, Horace Traubel, W. S. Kennedy, J. Addington Symonds, Bliss Perry, Dr. Johnston, J. W. Wallace, Prof. Holloway, Gerald Bullett and Edward Carpenter —with the casual remarks of Thoreau and Emerson and Russell Lowell and Oliver Wendell Holmes dragged in . . . . Then (if I had time) I could finish with five

minutes about the text! I could do all this but I imagine the only result would be that I should convince my hearers that I had lost my balance!

When we have really accepted the Larger Bible, this kind of preaching—or anything even approaching it will be impossible. We shall begin to get things in their true perspective. The Larger Bible is there, waiting to be used. Some of it has been done up in handy form by our anthologists. With the Larger Bible in use there can never be any difficulty in finding sources of inspiration or passages for devotional or church reading, for we live in an age, which possesses "no single bible, saviour merely," but "saviours countless and bibles incessant, equal to any, divine as any."

I have heard religious people—even ministers of religion—speak sneeringly of "literary sermons," but I can never understand why they do it. Either they have not grasped the fact that the Bible is literature, or they have never realized that the best books are deeply religious. A sermon about Job is as much a literary sermon as a sermon about Goethe's "Faust," and a sermon about the "Story of the Other Wise Man," by Henry Van Dyke, or "The Great Stone Face," by Nathaniel Hawthorne may be just as deeply religious as a sermon about the Good Samaritan or the Prodigal Son. To sneer about "literary sermons" is to advertise the fact that you are still to some extent a fundamentalist. You have torn the Bible away from its context in world literature, and are thinking of it as in a class apart. From that position to fundamentalism of the most objectionable type is an easy step.

We must take the Bible as literature—nothing more —nothing less. A true appreciation of the Bible will free men from bondage to any Bible, for it will reveal a world of literature in which they may find help and inspiration. They will be drawn into the great brotherhood of books. "Art," says John Galsworthy "is the one form of human energy which really works for union and destroys the barriers between man and man. It is the continual, unconscious replacement of one self by another." The brotherhood of books is a very real thing. It is a unifying force, for it is based on the love of the true, the beautiful, and the good.

By using the Larger Bible we are preparing the way for the new world order of which we dream, for books can unite nations and cement peoples. The works of Homer, Dante, Cervantes, Shakespeare and Goethe, have gone round the world proving to men of all countries that the same heart beats in every human breast. "The age of world literature is at hand," said Goethe, "and everyone ought to work in order to accelerate this new era." It is world literature that I have called the Larger Bible. Have you ever thought that world literature if produced in sufficient quantities might mean the end of war with all its beastliness and horror? There were Englishmen in the Great War who hated to fight Germany because they too loved Goethe and Schiller, and I am sure that more than one German soldier shuddered at the thought that he might be killing a potential Shakespeare. We are farther from the possibility of war with France with every volume of Hugo, Dumas and Anatole France that is read with appreciation by Englishmen, and with every volume of Dickens or Hardy or H. G. Wells that is devoured by the French lover of books. To produce a piece of world literature in this or any other country is better than sending out a whole boat load of diplomatists. A great book draws people together and inspires in them a common love. "Whenever I meet an Englisman," said Alexandre Dumas, "I consider it my duty to be agreeable to him as part of the debt I owe to Shakespeare and Walter Scott." . . . . . That is how it works. Get people to love what you love and they will soon love you.

That is the secret of the brotherhood of books. It is built up on a common love of the beautiful and the noble. It is the spirit that unites, not the letter. To the lover of Wordsworth it does not really matter whether the poet was born at Cockermouth or Whitehaven; it is not really important whether Dove Cottage stands on the right or left side of the Windermere-Keswick road. What matters is that here was a man who saw God in the trees and the flowers and who passed on to us something of that vision of beauty. Lovers of Shakespeare know quite well that it does not really matter whether Sir Philip Sidney or someone else was the poet's patron. The identity of the Dark Lady of the Sonnets will never become a matter of first class importance, and even the Baconian heresy does not separate lovers or cause family feuds. All join in thankfulness that the lives of men have been enriched by the fancies of a poet of genius. Or turn to Walt Whitman. I know something of Whitman lovers, but I can find no hatred, envy or uncharitableness amongst them about the disputed question as to whether the poet's function was a Messianic one or whether he represented the divine average. All are united in rejoicing because of the spirit of comradeship that throbs through "Leaves of Grass."

I am inclined to believe with that great Atheist, William Johnson Fox, that "our poets are better expositors than our priests of what constitutes consecration or sanctification." It is the high priesthood of literature that is proving to men that the earth is all hallowed ground. When you have looked over the White Gate with Michael Fairless or dreamed dreams in the desert with Olive Schreiner you realize that the sleepy Sussex village or the wide-stretching veldt may be a Holy Land. When you have seen the world through the eyes of a Thoreau or a Wordsworth or a Francis Thompson you know that heaven may begin in Concord or the English Lake District. You look and behold, even in the dismal streets of the crowded city, visions of beauty catch your eye.

> But, (when so sad thou canst not sadder)
> Cry; and upon thy so sore loss
> Shall shine the traffic of Jacob's ladder,
> Pitched between Heaven and Charing Cross.
>
> Yea, in the night, my soul, my daughter,
> Cry, clinging heaven by the hems:
> And lo, Christ walking on the water,
> Not of Gennesaret, but Thames.

The world's creative writers are the great linkers-up of humanity, and if we use the Larger Bible we may help men to catch the same spirit. And at the same time we shall be proving to the world that the fundamentalist is wrong. The man who is trying to get along with his one Bible (however great that Bible may be) is missing so much. To use a phrase from the Hindu Scriptures, he is "like one who while the sun shines shall search with a lamp." The trouble is that it is difficult to make people believe that the sun is shining—especially if they are in the paraffin trade or are out to sell a new line in lamp-shades! And if by any chance they have served a three years' apprenticeship in a lamp factory the task is almost hopeless!

But the sun "*is* shining, and we must go on with our task of turning men's attention to its far-reaching rays. As Emerson said, "We shall not always set so great a price on a few texts, or a few lives." We shall begin to practise our belief in the divinity of man. We shall become universalists, using the Larger Bible—the inspired literature of all time.

Thoreau's prophecy will come true. The Vaticans of the future *will* be filled with the classics and Scriptures of all centuries and all nations—Vedas and Zendavestas and Bibles, with Homers and Dantes and Shakespeares. "By such a pile we may hope to scale heaven at last."

Chatham, England. WILL HAYES.

War as Self-Defense

Mr. John W. Davis—you may recall that he was the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1924—said in a speech at Sea Girt last August:

> There is no instance in recorded history when any civilized nation has admitted that it was engaged in war for any purpose but self-defense.

All the belligerents in the World War entered this plea of justification. In 1915 Bertrand Russell said:

> Serbia is defending itself against the brutal aggression of Austria-Hungary. Austria-Hungary is defending itself against the disruptive revolutionary agitation which Serbia is believed to have fomented. Russia is defending Slavdom against the menace of Teutonic aggression. Germany is defending Teutonic civilization against the encroachment of the Slav. France is defending itself against a repetition of 1870. And England, which sought only the preservation of the status quo, is defending itself against a prospective menace to its maritime supremacy.

When the United States joined in the general madness, we made the same plea of self-defense!

The trouble with that plea is not only that it becomes absurd when made by all the belligerents on both sides in every war, but also that experience demonstrates that war affords no real defense. War is in itself the supreme evil, comprehending as it does every kind of wickedness, of suffering and of loss. The military outcome—victory or defeat—is relatively of slight importance. Both sides sacrifice their most precious possession, human life, in approximately equal measure. To engage in a war for the sake of self-defense is like committing suicide in order to ward off the smallpox.

One of the main reasons why self-defense is so generally regarded as a justification of war is the prevalence of a code of national honor corresponding to that of duelists, according to which a nation must violently resent certain wrongs or even discourtesies, or itself lose caste. What is that sensitive thing called national honor? It is something quite indefinite. But this is certain, that a country's true honor can not be tarnished by anything that a foreign country can do, but only by its own acts. In old days the duelist thought he must fight in certain circumstances to keep his self-respect. When enabled to reach a finer self-respect, it was impossible for him to enter a duel. President Wilson before he succumbed to the war-madness said: "There is such a thing as a nation being too proud to fight." Verily, there is! And some of us hoped, when he said the words, that ours was such a country, with too much proper pride, too much self-respect, too much commonsense to degrade itself by entering the European slaughter-house. But we were disappointed.

When one is struck, retaliation, blow for blow, is instinctive. The man who is assaulted resists automatically, having no time to deliberate and apply to his situation the principles of ethics or the considerations of expediency. But this is no justification of war. A nation should and can take time to deliberate, like the sensible king in the parable of Jesus who sits down and takes counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand. What is the likelihood of victory? What will be the cost of victory? Are there values at stake commensurate with that estimated cost? And what assurance is there that victory will conserve those values? May not concession or even surrender to the aggressor promise better results in the end than resistance? Instinct can not answer such questions. But they ought to be answered. It will be the part of wisdom not to yield to the hot-headed clamor: "We have been defied, our honor is at stake, our flag has been insulted!" There is always a better way out of every difficulty than the way of war, war being in itself the sum of all villainies and the cumulation of all evils. One of the wisest men America has produced was Benjamin Franklin. He was not given to exaggeration. He meant it when he said: "There never was a good war, or a bad peace."

At present all armaments are maintained ostensibly for self-defense only. Military men in this country when addressing the public frequently utter an apologetic note, as if they felt somewhat ashamed of their calling, as indeed they ought. They take great pains to represent themselves as defenders of their country. They would like to have the army and navy known as the Department of Defense. They roundly condemn aggressive war. But the maintenance of armament is itself aggressive. It is an accusation of other nations, presupposing evil intentions on their part, and virtually charging them with hypocrisy inasmuch as they like ourselves, deny any purpose of aggression. Well said Nietzsche, a Saul among the prophets:

> The doctrine of the army as a means of self-defense must be abjured as completely as the lust of conquest. Better to perish than to hate and fear, and twice as far better to perish than to make oneself hated and feared—this must some day become the supreme maxim of every political community.

Perhaps a nation, as Nietzsche forecasted, will some time have courage enough to disarm without waiting for the other nations to do likewise, trusting in the justice which it does to all peoples, in the good-will which it feels toward all, as its sure defense. Such trust will not be in vain. So Emerson taught in the finest piece of pacifist literature America has produced, in which he said:

> Whenever we see the doctrine of peace embraced by a nation, we may be assured it will not be one that invites injury; but one, on the contrary, which has a friend in the bottom of the heart of every man, even the violent and the base; one against which no weapon can prosper; one which is looked upon as the asylum of the human race, and has the tears and blessings of mankind.

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

THE STUDY TABLE

On International Relations

No man in the United States commands more respect for actual service rendered than John Bassett Moore. We have never had his superior in our Department of State and his writings on International Law are authoritative. The book before us [1] consists of a series of essays and addresses, written or delivered at various times and called forth by various occasions. The essay that gives title to the book is the amplification and revision of an address given in 1923 at the Annual Convocation of the University of the State of New York. Its basic idea is to controvert the common assumption that the recent war has upset all the accepted principles of international law. Thus, before the war it had been fairly established that a distinction exists between combatants and non-combatants and that non-combatants should be secure against injuries; that property not intended for military use and not likely to be used for military ends should not be destroyed; that private property in general was not subject to confiscation; that neutral states have a right to continue commerce with each other and even, under prescribed limitations, with the warring powers. It is often claimed that these principles were flouted in the late war and that the future will ignore them. Our author asserts that the late war was not different from others; it was not even so much greater than others as to give it destructive influence on principles of law. It is true that all these principles were transgressed, that they were set aside under the excuse of military necessity. But Dr. Moore insists that the principles remain; the law, though broken, has the same force as before. The ground on which it is based is as valid as ever. Instead of erasing the principles from our books, they should be restated with greater emphasis. The other essays deal with such matters as contraband of war, international arbitration, the permanent court of international justice, rules of warfare: aircraft and radio. These and other topics are discussed with such clarity and simplicity that they become interesting reading even to one not versed in law and legal phraseology. Dr. Moore's story of the Permanent Court is a convenient summary of its origin, its establishment and its work to date. While we disapprove the court, we are glad to have so complete a statement of its nature, history and function. The United States has not recognized the Court, but Dr. Moore is one of its Judges and speaks with exceptional authority. His statement regarding rules of warfare in the use of aircraft and radio has particular value from the fact that he himself was a member of the commission which met at The Hague, December 11, 1922 to February 19, 1923. In fact he was its presiding officer. The Conference was made up of representatives from the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan and the Netherlands. Their discussion was serious and searching. The rules developed were specific and detailed. Whatever may be true when they are put to the test in actual warfare, their determination and statement is worth while and a step forward. It will be seen that these essays have a general and timely interest.

Quite different in character and scope is Charles G. Fenwick's "International Law." [2] Moore's book is not, in any sense of the word, a text-book, nor does it attempt to cover the field of international law. Fenwick's book *is* a textbook, aiming to cover the entire subject.[2] It is systematically developed, carefully organized, and supplied with an analytical table of contents, a list of works referred to, a table of cases and a well developed index. It is necessarily professional in its presentation and technical in its matter. Yet it is written in a style so lucid, that it is not only comprehensible but attractive to the reader who wants authoritative information on those international questions which now constantly present themselves. It is naturally a book of reference, to be consulted as questions arise. Few, except students, will read it through from cover to cover, continuously. But anyone might find it interesting and profitable to read *Part I—The Science of International Law,* just as they would read any other book for pleasure and profit. The book falls into four parts—The Science of International Law, The Persons of International Law, Substantive International Law, International Procedure for the Protection of Rights. The work is sufficiently up-to-date to include the permanent court and the regulations of the conference on aerial warfare. There are appendices —A. The Covenant of the League of Nations; B. Permanent Court of International Justice (protocol, optional clause and statute in full); C. Select References. This last is particularly convenient, giving for each chapter the books and references bearing upon the topics discussed. All in all, the book is an up-to-date, convenient handbook in a field which today interests everyone. It is a volume in *The Century Political Science Series,* which is under the general editorial direction of Professor Frederic A. Ogg of the University of Wisconsin, which is planned to run to more than a score of volumes, each dealing with a live and important theme.

Willard D. Straight was a remarkable man, son of an able father and an unusual mother. His life was a romance, and he delighted in romance. The story of his life, written by Herbert Croly, who was intimately associated with him in his last years, is almost entirely made up from the mother's diary, the earlier and later diaries of Straight himself, and from correspondence.[3] The reading of it is rather depressing and one almost wishes that the biography had been written by George Marvin, who was associated with Willard Straight in the days of his spectacular enterprises and would have written more objectively. Croly believes that in Straight's case environment (training) had the upper hand of heredity. Perhaps he is right, and perhaps Willard Straight's strength and weakness, brilliancy and dullness, successes and failures, are attributable in large part to his bringing up. His father died when he was a mere child, his mother directed his development from his birth to the time of her death, when he was but ten years old; he was then the ward of a well-meaning and high-principled spinster, who finally sent him to a military school. After his father's death the mother went to Japan as a teacher and the boy was for a time amid Oriental surroundings. He then perhaps received impressions that influenced his career. Willard Straight was impulsive, ambitious, talented, brilliant and persuasive. Few men have had greater power to surround himself with friends; few have been so thoughtful and gen-

[1] "International Law and Some Current Illusions: and other essays." John Bassett Moore. New York: 1924. The Macmillan Co. 8vo, pp. xviii. 381.

[2] "International Law." Charles G. Fenwick. New York: 1924. The Century Co. 8vo, pp. xxxvii. 641.

[3] "Willard Straight." Herbert Croly. New York: 1925. The Macmillan Co. 8vo, pp. xvi. 569.

tle in friendship. His influence was largely due to his winsomeness He had a short and varied career. He rarely stuck to one thing long enough to carry it through. He began in the Chinese Customs Service under Sir Robert Hart; he drifted from it into war-correspondence, during the Russo-Japanese war; he was then vice-consul in Korea, staying by his post until Korean foreign affairs were taken over by Japan; then consul-general at Mukden, where his grand schemes for American commerce and political influence in Manchuria developed; in trying to materialize these he became the associate of world financiers and when they failed he was a cog in J. P. Morgan's machine; his interest in the Orient led to his furthering American-Oriental interests in New York City. He was president of the American Asiatic Association and through it launched the magazine, *Asia;* he established the luncheon club, *India House.* During this period of New York activities, with his wife, equally interested, he financially aided *The New Republic.* It was in this connection, that his relations with Herbert Croly, his biographer, developed. With our entry into the war, Willard Straight's energy found a new outlet. He went to France, with rank of Major, and did valuable service in administrative work. He longed to take part in active fighting, but never had the opportunity. He was stricken after the armistice and after a few days' illness died, just when his peculiar experiences would have made him a valuable helper in peace adjustment. He was still a young man of 38 years. He had a rich and varied experience. In the last year of his life he wrote, in a letter to his wife:

> I've always been finding myself in places more important than I was really able to fill. I've never had the foundation for my own jobs—except, perhaps, the political foundation for the Chinese loan business and for my work in the State Department. I tried to do architecture by clever drawing instead of hard study. In the Customs service I merely started. I was an amateur correspondent and an amateur consul. When I took on the Group I was not a banker. Then when I started soldiering, instead of beginning as I should at the bottom in the training camps, I deluded myself into thinking that my administrative experience would be more valuable to the Government in the Adjutant General's department than would my service as a real soldier in the line. Always I have been too hasty and anxious to hit the high spots. I couldn't rise because I didn't have the fundamentals. In later years I think no one worked harder than I, but I have always been trying to catch up, when I should have known things instinctively.

This was written in a time of discouragement; to a degree it is true. But Willard Straight's friends and the future will not consent to judge him so harshly.

Willard Straight was in Korea in her last days of independence; his sympathies were with her and a strong feeling of dislike and suspicion for Japan was aroused in him there; when at Mukden, his dream was to block Japanese development in Manchuria, to develop American interests in such wise as to stay and checkmate Japan. He did not see, what is certainly true, that China will not pull herself together without Japanese assistance; that we shall develop in that part of the world only with Japanese friendship; more—we shall make no harvest there unless Japan prospers. Later in his life, Straight saw this more clearly. George Marvin, in a recent article, says:

> Before his death, just six years ago, Straight himself had clearly realized, as he often told the writer, that the only practical recipe for an open door in North China lay in a frank and cordial joint policy between the United States and Japan. During his consulship he advocated a hard competition in Manchuria. In his later life—though less than ten years later—he knew that competition could never solve that international problem.

Willard Straight was a clever artist. Wherever he chanced to be he sketched the life and scenes about him. There were times when he even thought of art as a profession. The book is adorned with many of his sketches which add much to the interest of the story. In his references to other persons Mr. Croly makes occasional slips. Was Alexander Agassiz director of the Penikese school in its first season? Who is the Colonel D. W. Parker with whom Willard Straight's father was associated? If we pick up these slips probably others will find more.

FREDERICK STARR.

A Scientist Speaks to Bryan

This book* is a rush order. It is dedicated to "John Thomas Scopes, courageous teacher," recently tried and convicted at Dayton; its opening chapter is a statement of "the real issue" in the Tennessee trial; its target is the special attorney for the prosecution in this same trial. Published not after but *before* the Dayton court was called to order by Judge Raulston, the volume has a newspaper timeliness made possible by the fact that no less than four of its five chapters had already seen the light—one in the New York *Times,* and the other three in the *Forum.*

The book is of course journalistic in style, but for this very reason extremely valuable as a handbook for the multitudes who are seeking light on the vexed question of evolution. Professor Osborn is a great scholar, and everything that he writes has authority. Like his great teacher, Huxley, he is not ashamed to talk the language of the common man, and give him the facts that he should know. In this unpretentious little volume he presents some of the evidence for Darwin's theory, shows its unquestioned place in the world of science, and states its constructive relationship with religion and morality. Mr. Bryan will not hear what the earth here eloquently speaks through its reverent interpreter, Professor Osborn, but there are millions of those who were his fellow-citizens, we must believe, who have good ears and will gladly listen. J. H. H.

HEART'S COMEDY

I lifted out my battered heart upon a little spade,
And put it on the table to see how it was made,
To see where it was broken, to diagnose its pain,
To see if I could mend it and make it go again.

I looked upon it there as it lay all white and red,
And then I sighed and spoke to it, and this is what I said:
"I know your little secret now—I've guessed it all these years;
It isn't blood you traffic in, but only bitter tears!"

I put away my battered heart and locked it in its place,
And went into the world again with a smile upon my face;
I know it can't be mended much, but if it does not show
I can make believe it works all right, and none will ever know!

For UNITY. JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

MY WORLD

My world is one of birds and swaying breeze,
Of silver-footed brook through arching trees.
Beyond its beauty men in vain aspire
To reach the fields of their unquenched desire
In blindness and in selfishness of mind
Laying a curse on all of human kind.
Others may lose their trust in God and men,
Others may grieve and others doubt again,
Here trees are green, here skies are warm and blue,
Here have I held my faith in God and you!

LUCIA TRENT.

* "The Earth Speaks To Bryan," by Henry Fairfield Osborn. Published by Scribner's, New York.

CORRESPONDENCE

IS THE CHRIST MIND AN IMPEDIMENT TO PROGRESS?

Editor of UNITY:

It is almost incredible that at this hour of the world a statement should be made by an educated man like the following by Mr. Morrison I. Swift, a "radical" writer on social topics in a recent number of the *Boston Herald*: "Jesus had no personal ethics which apply soundly and savingly to individuals in the modern world. All Jesus's thinking revolved about one theme—a future life, another world. With him this world and this life were not of enough significance to trouble seriously about. . . The mind and life of Christ give no valid light or information how to live in and conduct this world if, as an ever growing majority of moderns think, this world and this life are of very great importance in themselves. Man's life on this globe would be priceless if men would slough off the past and all past leadership and devote their whole brains, energy and material wealth to making it priceless. The consolidated team-work of all present living minds must take the place of the other-world ancient mind of Christ if tottering civilization and our world are to be saved."

It would be foolish to protest against a statement like this if ignorance of the Bible and Christ's teachings were not so common. There are multitudes of young people who need to be reminded, in the face of these wild assertions, that Christ's words and work had to do predominantly with this world and this life. Even the passages in Matthew about the end of the world are of doubtful authenticity. The thought of the "second coming" grew in the half century between the death of Christ and the writing of the early gospels, playing a vastly greater part in the mind of the persecuted disciples than it could ever have done in this. Jesus spoke often and seriously of the future life, because he believed in immortality, and knew that life here, as all history teaches, can be most nobly and productively lived in the consciousness of its eternal issues. But his life of going about doing good, healing the sick, relieving distress, giving peace to the troubled, and teaching his followers to work and pray that God's kingdom come on earth—three quarters of the record—had to do with their world and ours; and his preaching, from The Sermon on the Mount to the last talk to his disciples before the crucifixion, in which he comforted and fortified them for the days when they must go on without him, was the same. It was "on earth" that God's kingdom, the rule of righteous men, was to be established.

This can not here be argued: but when our people are told that the "chief impediment" to making this a better world is the "ancient mind of Christ," it may be wholesome for them to consider that some things in this world are never "ancient," that Plato and Kant have more to do with our own good thinking than Haeckel and Spencer—although they will find nothing in the "Republic" about the Fordney tariff or the Volstead act,—and that the best minds of the ages, from Paul and Augustine to Jefferson and Emerson, have found Christ their contemporary and their most illuminating teacher. "The truth before Plato," certainly; but the impulse summarily to kick the whole body of the world's most revered thinkers out of court is not the impulse of the philosopher.

There was never a time when the disparagement of Christ's mind and principles in their application to the relations of men in society was more inopportune and unfortunate. Christ's own mind moved not peculiarly on the plane of yesterday or tomorrow, though like all supreme minds it was prophetic. Although he moved naturally, a man among men, in his own time, his instruction and inspiration were for all time. If any young man or woman feels prompted for the first time to study the subject, the Four Gospels can be had cheap: and the serious student may profitably read Francis G. Peabody's "Jesus Christ and the Social Question" and "The Christian Life in the Modern World." Said Edward Everett Hale: "When Jesus spoke of the kingdom of God, and when his apostles spoke, the reason was distinct; and when they prayed, as he taught them to pray, their first prayer was for this 'kingdom of God' 'thy kingdom come.' What he taught them, and what they believed, was that a real kingdom of God was to come in this world that they lived in, and when the Christian Church, in any of its simpler or more intelligent moments, falls back on the foundation truths, this is what it teaches now: that God can reign in his world, and that he is to reign here. It does not so much discuss the origin of evil as proclaim the overthrow of evil. All things bad, mean, cruel, painful, distressing, unjust, unclean, untrue, shall cease to be. God shall reign. The time shall come that in this world, which we choose to call the world of man, everything will obey his purpose. Man and man's will, the earth with all its methods, will obey God. God's kingdom will come."

Boston, Mass. EDWIN D. MEAD.

MR. COOKE'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Editor of UNITY:

I have just finished reading the concluding instalment in UNITY of October 19, 1925, of George Willis Cooke's "The Story of My Mind" and I cannot refrain from writing you my deep regret that it is the last of that very interesting series of articles,—in which were made apparent the native modesty, fairness, sense of justice, uncomplaining and restrained references therein to what were agonizing experiencs of a patient and noble soul in the face of personal tragedies and disappointments (for which he too often took the blame himself). In these articles, I could hear the voice of my simple, sincere, and learned friend speak to me as he did in the days of his excellent life among us. How I wish that he might have been spared to us many more years in the flesh. But, alas, such was not to be. However, I earnestly hope and believe that he will not be forgotten nor the lesson and example of his useful life, as most certainly neither he nor they will not be forgotten by those who knew him most intimately. I regard this last instalment of the late Wm. Cooke's self-revelation a masterpiece of truth and self-restrained expression.

CHARLES C. RAMSAY.

ABANDONED FARMS

Editor of UNITY:

Your story about wild horses and wolves making their appearance in this country in sections that have not known them for generations, and pointing out how there is a constant increase in abandoned farms because so many farmers found it impossible even to make a poor living on them, did seem incredible.

But some statistics recently sent out by the United States Department of Agriculture show that the number of cultivated farms in Ohio during the past five years, has decreased by nearly 12,000. In Indiana they decreased by over 9,000, in Illinois by 11,500, in Michigan by over 4,000, in New York by nearly 4,500.

And in the United States as a whole the decrease in the number amounts to 75,785.

These figures represent, of course, the net decrease. In certain sections of the United States there has been a slight increase.

But the statistics prove that rural life is breaking down, as you have stated, and partly due to the fact that income taxes on the wealthy and the fortunes left by wealthy men, are being decreased, which means in the long run a heavier burden of taxation on farms and all other real estate.

Madison, Wis. CHESTER C. PLATT.

FRATERNITY

Editor of UNITY:

Men have been applying democracy to politics for more than a century. We have held that the people should rule through their elected representatives instead of being ruled by appointees of kings and their subordinates. We have tried to extend democracy within and without our land.

We have made efforts to apply democracy to our industries, giving the workers more voice in the direction of the business in which they earn their living.

Three great principles of democracy are Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Liberty—freedom in thought, belief and action. Equality before the law and in opportunity for expression in every phase of life. Fraternity, the mingling with our kind in friendly intercourse and relationship.

Possessing these things men and women may live wholesome, satisfactory lives. Not least in importance is Fraternity. The fraternal spirit developed strongly in the homes of our Colonial ancestors was largely responsible for the courage and perseverance that won our independence.

The importance of the home cannot be over-estimated. Early settlers endured great privation and risked their lives to establish and maintain their homes.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

LECTURE TRIP OF ANNA LOUISE STRONG

In the absence of my daughter from America, I am undertaking to arrange her lecture trip. I am telling some of her friends and the supporters of the work in Russia that she will return to Seattle—via the Orient—about the *middle of December*. After the holidays, she will proceed to Chicago and New York via California on a lecture tour. Following is a line of her travel with a few engagements indicated that have already been made.

1926

Jan. 5, 6—Portland, Oregon.

Jan. 8—Stockton, Women's Club, at 2:30 p. m. with public meeting at night.

Jan. 9-14—San Francisco and vicinity.

Jan. 15-20—Los Angeles and vicinity.

Jan. 24—Denver, Dr. Lackland's Open Forum.

Jan. 26-27—Pittsburg, Kan. and Kansas City.

Jan. 30—St. Louis City Club (noon).

Jan. 31—Between St. Louis and Chicago.

Feb. 1-8—Around Chicago (engagements made: Feb. 1st, Nineteenth Century Club; Feb. 5th, Friday Morning Forum at Lincoln Center; Feb. 8, Jewish Women's Council).

Feb. 7 or 14—Detroit Open Forum.

Feb. 21—New York Open Forum. Dr. Holmes Community Church.

March 7—Boston—Old South Open Forum 3:15 p. m.

Several other engagements were tentatively made by my daughter when she was East last spring.

I take the liberty of mentioning—without their permission—the names of the following people who will, I think, be willing to discuss and arrange dates in their vicinity. Dr. Ellen Hayes of Wellesley, Mass.; Miss Emma Duke, 14 E. 30th, New York City and Miss Maxwell Community Church, 12 Park Ave., N. Y. City; Mrs. Lucy L. W. Wilson, Broad St. and Snyder Ave., Philadelphia; Miss Johnson, Abraham Lincoln Center, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago; Mrs. Helen S. Rosenfels, 333 Linden Ave., Oak Park, Ill. and Mrs. Dakin Smith, 207 No. Grove Ave., Oak Park, Ill.; Mr. Gustavus Tuckerman, Secy. City Club, St. Louis; Dr. Geo. S. Lackland, Community Church, Denver; Rev. E. A. Robinson, Palo Alto, California; my cousin Arthur B. Strong, 2002 No. Robles Ave., Pasadena, Calif.; Miss K. Lucy Trevett, 777 Flanders St. and Miss Elsa Grelle, 859 Northrup Ave.—both of Portland, Oregon. Or, I may be written direct—although nothing will be consummated without consultation with someone in that locality.

There will be inquiry about charges—From Clubs and Forums that pay a fixed fee my daughter has received $25, $50 and $100—usually not less than fifty. For labor and church groups, it depends so much on circumstances, that it will be necessary to make arrangements. As to talks, gratis, to students and like groups my daughter has always been generous, but her speeches ought not to exceed two or three a day—and, frankly, her income is derived from her writings and lectures. This enables her to turn 100 per cent of all donations over into the work, besides giving some on her own account. In every locality where there is a considerable group of supporters of the work in Russia she will wish to meet them for a conference and to give a close-up view of the situation.

This covers the ground, I believe. If I have taken undue liberties, pardon me, and put it down against the limited time in a busy man's life.

Cordially,

SYDNEY STRONG.

508 Garfield Street, Seattle.

Nov. 1, 1925.

I wish I might see this schedule complete by the middle of December.

AN APPEAL FOR ANITA WHITNEY

Governor F. W. Richardson,
Sacramento, Calif.

My dear sir:—

The Seattle Fellowship, at its regular meeting last, unanimously approved of the following communication to be sent you:

"President Coolidge and others prominent in public life are calling attention to the growing menace of intolerance in our country. While recognizing that our State has short-comings of its own, yet our attention has been drawn to the case of Anita Whitney, a citizen of your State, who is liable to be sent to prison on account of her political opinions. She is well known along the Pasific Coast as a woman of high character who has rendered years of social service, and it would seem to us that something was radically wrong should such women be incarcerated.

"We, members of the Seattle Fellowship, respectfully request you to use such governmental machinery as to make such a conclusion impossible. We are convinced that if such people are imprisoned, not for overt acts in law-breaking, but for their opinions, the spirit of intolerance will be increased. We believe that political repression is a dangerous form of intolerance and defeats its own purpose."

Wishing you well in all the grave tasks that your hands find to do and hoping that you may find your way to grant this request

For the Seattle Fellowship,

SYDNEY STRONG,
Exec. Secy.

[NOTE: We print this as a model for the kind of letter that should be sent by all our readers to the Governor of California. We assume that the case of Miss Whitney is familiar, and thus needs no explanation, at this late date.—Editors.]

UNIQUE HONOR FOR NANSEN

The first foreigner to be granted an honorary degree by a university in Soviet Russia is Dr. Fridjof Nansen, the famous explorer and peace advocate. He visited Russian Armenia recently on a survey of the work of Near East Relief, with a view to colonizing additional Armenian refugees on farms in their old country. In recognition of this work, he has been granted an honorary degree by the University of Erivan.

At Alexandropol, where the Near East Relief work is centered, Dr. Nansen was greeted by representatives of the entire Armenian nation, gathered under the shadow of Mount Ararat. To them he expressed, on behalf of the League of Nations, the sympathy and sorrow of the civilized world over the tribulations of the Armenian nation during the past decade. After the ceremonies, Dr. Nansen reviewed 12,000 orphans from the American training schools located in the nearby plain. Later he was a guest of honor at a Golden Rule dinner attended by all the children. He said:

"Golden Rule Sunday, which will be observed by fifty nations next December on behalf of the orphaned children of the Near East, is a world-wide demon-

---

Under the cultural, refining influence of the home the men whose names we revere developed the ability and character to establish this great democracy.

The Town Meeting at which the citizens gathered to conduct their public affairs could not have been successful had there not been the home influence. Their decisions rested upon their abiding faith in their homes. To protect their homes they lived and died. The same spirit has animated the pioneers who steadily marched westward until nearly the whole country has become settled.

With the growth of cities and the increase in factory production a change has come. Year by year more people are living outside the influence of home life thus losing this fireside fellowship, cultural influence and fraternal spirit. The effect of this change is clearly seen in our political, economic, social and religious life.

Believing that this lessening of home influence upon the affairs of the community, state and nation is very detrimental and that nothing else can so well promote human welfare a specific and determined effort should be made to restore the influence of the home in public affairs.

The home stands supreme as an agency to build character, mold sentiment and promote human welfare. The sacred influence of the home, the fellowship of the fireside and the fraternal spirit can develop and organize a public opinion that will control public affairs, settle correctly all national and international questions, assure world peace, and establish the reign of Good Will on earth.

President Coolidge has well said, "Look well, then, to the hearthstone. Therein all hope of America lies."

I suggest that citizens initiate a home movement, a Fireside Fraternity, to do that very thing. I believe that the hope of America does lie in the home and its influence. All the forces that center in the home should be used for the common good. The purpose of such a movement may be expressed in these words: *To establish justice in all human relations.* This means that *love* must be the directing influence. The Golden Rule must be the guide in all social, political and industrial affairs.

Fraternity with one another.
Fellowship with truth.
Service to humanity.

Beginning in the home, the creative source of life, there must go forth the New Spirit of unselfish service in social, political and industrial life to establish Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, with Justice to all mankind.

Springfield, Mass. H. F. KENDALL.

stration of our interest and sympathy for Armenia. On that day thousands of people in far-off countries will share the same meagre fare which these orphans have daily, and thousands of households will express the spirit of the Golden Rule by making their generous gifts to this great humanitarian work."

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHINA PASSES RESOLUTION

At a meeting of officers of the Institute in Shanghai the following Resolution relating to recent friction in different parts of China was unanimously passed and ordered to be sent to the press, to government authorities and to different organizations interested in China:—

Whereas the International Institute of Chine during the thirty years since it was first established has had as its main object the promotion of harmony between China and foreign countries and between one religion and another, and during this period has had many public gatherings of this friendly character, and

Whereas at the present time growing friction and misunderstanding have arisen between certain classes of the Chinese and foreigners in different parts of China, creating a dangerous and difficult situation for the Chinese and foreign Governments.

Therefore be it *Resolved,*

First, that we recommend that all responsible authorities make a careful and sympathetic study of all the causes that have brought about the present friction, and that instead of pursuing a course of mutual antagonism, hate and mistrust, they adopt peaceful methods and harmonious action in accordance with the principles of justice, and

Second, that the responsible authorities at once seek by co-operative action and joint commissions to confer together in a friendly and conciliatory spirit for the removal of existing friction on lines most suitable to Chinese conditions and such as will tend to prevent similar unfortunate occurrences in the future, and,

Third, that, believing that the Root Resolutions and the subsequent Treaty of the Washington Conference aim at promoting the realization of China's righteous national aspirations and the developing and securing of an effective stable government so that China may be a strong united nation holding her true position among the family of nations on terms of equality, it is hoped that the foreign Governments and the Chinese Government together will make full use of the present opportunity of arriving at a complete friendly understanding in accordance with the principles of the Washington Conference Treaty.

Reprinted from The Peking Leader,

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel., Atlantic 1876

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Monroe 6940 732 W. Van Buren St., CHICAGO

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!

Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.

Insist on

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE AT PORTER'S 4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM DOMESTIC COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office 608 S. Dearborn St. CHICAGO

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

NOVEMBER

With its brisk, wintry touches, suggests that your furs be at once conditioned for their season of heavy usage. Delicate, skilled and dependable are the processes by which we brush, cleanse, sanitize and prolong the life of the fur garments you entrust us with.

Schumann & Co Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0221 ; ; ; ; ALL DEPARTMENTS MAIN OFFICE AND WORK

3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read UNITY

224